

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 25-46 are pending. Claims 25-46 are rejected. In this response, claims 25, 32, 39, and 46 have amended without introducing any new matter. No claims have been cancelled or added. Thus, claims 25-46 remain pending. Reconsideration of this application, in light of the following remarks and amendments, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 25-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,613,100 B2 of Miller (hereinafter “Miller”). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Miller does not disclose each and every element of the invention claimed by the Applicant.

Miller describes a graphical user interface that presents a current document along with thumbnail images of documents, relevant to the current document (Miller, Abstract; Column 3, line 63 to Column 4, line 35). The content of each thumbnail, or related document, is predetermined according an “automatic content analysis procedure” (Miller, Column 5, lines 21-38). When a “user desires to access one of these documents, the user selects the appropriate thumbnail 270 via a user-input device (not shown), such as a computer mouse, trackball, etc. Such selection subsequently causes the desired document to be displayed on the display pane” (Miller, Column 4, lines 35-44). The automatic content analysis procedure then automatically loads a new set of thumbnails corresponding to the newly selected document (Miller, Column 7, line 66 to Column 8, line 2).

Claim 25, as amended, recites:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display, the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area, displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display;

(b) in response to a second signal indicative of a selection of the link within the document currently being displayed from the user input device, the second signal distinguishing from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document;

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display; and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to a user. (Emphasis Added)

That is, a current document is displayed in a first area and another document is displayed in a second display area “in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area, ... without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display.” Applicant respectfully submits that Miller fails to describe or suggest this feature. Rather, Miller describes automatically displaying thumbnails related to a document as determined by an “automatic content analysis procedure,” and not in response to a signal corresponding to pointer movement over a link. Furthermore, in order to change the contents of the display area that displays thumbnails, according to Miller, a user must select one of the thumbnails causing a new document to be displayed.

However, selection is not the same as “movement of a pointer over a link … without selecting the other document.” Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Miller fails to describe each and every feature as claimed by the Applicant.

The examiner argued that Miller specifically discloses the features noted above stating “Miller teaches claimed limitation at col. 4, lines 35-45, wherein Miller teaches selecting thumbnails through mouse or a pointer selection” (Office Action, page 5). However, as noted above, with respect to amended claim 25, the Applicant claims “in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area, displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display.” Thus, the display is triggered without selecting the other document. Because Miller explicitly teaches requiring the selection of a document to cause the display of related documents (Miller, column 4, lines 36-44), Miller fails to describe the limitations as claimed in amended claim 25.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome by the remarks. Since independent claims 32, 39, and 46 contain similar features and limitations to those discussed above, claims 32, 39, and 46 are also not anticipated by Miller under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for similar reasons. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Further, dependent claims 26-31, 33-38, and 40-45 depend from claims 25, 32, and 39, and include additional features and limitations. Since claims 25, 32, and 39 were

not anticipated by Miller under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Miller also fails to anticipate claims 26-31, 33-38, and 40-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 25-46 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/6/06

  
Michael J. Mallie  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300